



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/038,984	01/04/2002	Yin-Xiong Li	275.0003 0102	9705		
26813	7590 10/05/2005		EXAMINER			
	MUETING, RAASCH & GEBHARDT, P.A.			VIVLEMORE, TRACY ANN		
P.O. BOX 581415 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55458			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	•	·	1635			

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action						
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief						

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/038,984	LI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Tracy Vivlemore	1635		

	Lamine	Alt Ollic					
	Tracy Vivlemore	1635					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 14 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		RST REPLY WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	e filed within two mon	ths of the date				
of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))							
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the objection to the specification for presence of new matter. 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro-		rill be entered and an	explanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>21,75 and 76</u> .							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7,15-20,22-24,27-32,39,48,62,63,72	2-74 and 78-80.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	ched.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ance because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 8/10/05							
13. Other:							
	ANDORNANCE	TV					
	ANDREW WANG	September 30, 200	15				
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER							



TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the amendments to the claims do not overcome the 112, first paragraph enablement rejection. The amended claims are directed to a method of attenuating gene expression in zebrafish cells in vivo, which encompasses not only the exemplified embryo embodiments but also attenuation of gene expression in adult zebrafish. The use of the phrase "zebrafish cells" in the final rejection was meant to refer ocultured zebrafish cells, not zebrafish cells from any stage of development such as an adult. Note that the same sentence states the specification "does not reasonably provide enablement for attenuating the expression of any gene in vivo in any vertebrate cell except zebrafish embryos".